

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

COREY HARRIS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Civil Action No. 04-281 Erie
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
GREATER ERIE COMMUNITY	)	
ACTION COMMITTEE, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM ORDER**

Presently pending before the Court is a “Motion to Reconsider” this Court’s Memorandum Order [ECF No. 68] dated March 29, 2012 filed by Plaintiff, Corey Harris. *See* [ECF No. 70]. Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of this Court’s denial of his motion to reopen and/or reinstate a six year old case [ECF No. 61] and his motion to remove and reopen a state court case [ECF No. 62].

The Court may grant a motion for reconsideration if the moving party shows: (1) an intervening change in the controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence which was not available when the court issued its order; or (3) the need to correct a clear error of law or fact or to prevent a manifest injustice. *Lazaridis v. Wehmer*, 591 F.3d 666, 669 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 2010); *Max’s Seafood Café by Lou-Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros*, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1999). I find no basis under the above standard to grant the Plaintiff the requested relief. In his motion, he merely reasserts arguments previously considered and rejected by the Court, and his remaining allegations are rambling and incoherent.

AND NOW, this 26<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2012, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion for Reconsideration [ECF No. 70] is DENIED.

s/ Sean J. McLaughlin  
United States District Judge

cm: All parties of record